thing for the privilege which he is to enjoy, and this something, in the form of duties, goes into the treasury, furnishing revenue to the government; and these duties operate to protect the feint product of labor and capital against a like foreign product.

This mode of levying duties answers a double purpose. It produces revenue to the government, and at the same time fosters and encourages the occupations of our own people, promotes industrial development, opens up new mines, builds new factories, and sustains those already established, which in turn furnish employment to labor at fair and remunerative wages. A revenue tariff accomplishes but a single purpose—that of raising revenue; it has no other mission; while a protective tariff accomplishes this and more—it brings revenue to the American treasury and discriminates in favor of the American citizen. A revenue tariff invites the product of foreign labor and foreign capital to occupy our markets free and unrestrained in competition with the product of our own labor and capital. A protective tariff invites the product of foreign labor and foreign capital which are necessary to the wants of our people (which we cannot produce in the United States) to occupy our markets and go untaxed to the people, but insists that every foreign product which is produced at home, or can be successfully, in quantities capable of supplying the domestic consumption, shall, whenever necessary to maintain suitable rewards to our labor, bear a duty which shall not be so high as to prohibit importations, but at such a rate as will produce the necessary revenues and at the same time not destroy but encourage American production. It says to the world of producers, "If you want to share with the citizens of the United States their home market, you must pay for the privilege of doing restrained competition with the product of our jown people, but shall be discriminated against to such an extent as to fully protect and defend

Hon. Alexander Stephens, a distinguished citizen of your own State, and endeared to the people of the South, stated on June 23, 1882, the theory so well that I beg to quote from

The best way to raise revenue is by duties upon imports. They bear less heavily on the tax-payers, and, as legislators, that is what we should look to. In levying duties on imports you can at the same time make foreign producers pay for the use of your markets, and in that way, incidentally and properly, give aid and protection to American industry. It is not true as a general proposition that the consumer pays all the duty imposed upon commodities brought from other countries. This is a question that I cannot now argue. In most instances, where the duties are judiciously laid, they are borne partly by the con-Sumer and partly by the importer.

To allow Congress thus to raise revenue by duties up-

on imports was one of the main objects in establishing the tederal Constitution of 1787. This system of nternal revenue taxation by excise and stain dutie was not favored by the fathers of the Republic in times of peace. I speak plainly, and say that it was looked upon then as not only of British origin, but there was always the odium of British Toryism attached to it in the American mind. There was never any legislation more abhorrent to the people of this country, even in their colonial condition, than what

was known as the infamous stamp act. It is alleged as a serious objection to protective duties that the tax, whatever it may be, increases the cost of the foreign as well as the Iomestic product to the extent of such tax or duty, and that it is wholly paid by the consumer. This objection would be worthy of serious consideration if it were true, but, as has been demonstrated over and over again, it is without foundation in fact. Wherever the foreign product has successful competition at bome the duty is rarely paid by the consumer. It is paid from the profits of the manufacturer, or divided between him and the merchant, or the importer, and diminishes their profits to that extent. Duty or no duty, without home competition the consumer would fare worse than he fares now. There is not in the long line of staple products consumed by the people a single one which has not been cheapened by competition at home, made possible by protectlve duties. There is not an article that enters into the every-day uses of the family which is produced in the United States that has not been made cheaper and more accessible as the result of home production and development, which was to be secured only by the sturdy maintenance of the protective system. While this is true of protective tariffs, exactly the opposite is true of revenue tariffs. They are always paid by the consumer. A duty put upon a foreign product the like of which is not produced at home, and which enters our markets free from home competition, the cost to the American consumer is exactly the foreign cost with the duty added, whatever that may be, much or little. Supposing, for example, there was a tax upon tea or coffee. There being no production of these articles in the United States, and therefore no competition here, the cost to the American publie would be the cost abroad and the duty added. We imported last year 526,489,000 pounds of coffee. A duty of 10 cents a pound would have produced to the government over \$52,000,000 which would have been paid by the 12,000,000 families of this country, consumers of this article. Eighty-seven million five hundred and eighty-four thousand pounds of tea were imported last year. At 10 cents a pound \$8,000,000 and upward would have gone into the treasury, every dollar of which would have been paid by our own people. Take sugar, as another example. We produced last year in this country shout 8 per cent. of what our people consumed. The duty collected from imported sugar amounted to \$58,000,000. The domestic production was so inconsiderable as compared with the domestic consumption as to have had little, if any, appreciable effect upon the price to the consumer, and therefore this sum was almost wholly paid by our own citizens, and the cost of sugar to the American consumer, because of the inadequate home supply, is practically the foreign price, duty added, the domestic production being so small contrasted with the domestic demand

The price to us is fixed by the 92 per cent. which came from abroad, plus the amount of | United States was alone 482,000,000 tons during | the duty collected at the custom-house. It | the same period. consumption was produced at home. If you take any American production which is large enough to supply the domestic demand, the effect is different. Then the foreign production must undersell the home production in order to get a foothold in this market, and therefore the foreign producer is willing to surrender the whole duty, or a considerable part of it, consenting to less profits for the sake of extending his markets, with the hope of ultimately destroying home competition. The real question, therefore, is whether in raising money to supply the government needs we should have thoughtful concern of the industrial interests of the people we represent, or, discarding every other consideration, shall adjust our duties upon the revenue principle to secure revenue, and revenue only. The money must be raised, and in raising it the protectionist is mindful of the interests of our own people. The tariff reformer is considerate of everybody else's interest but our own. I cannot understand why any patriotic citizen should prefer a revenue tariff to a protective tariff. I cannot understand why so long as taxation must be resorted to (and that will be the case so long as governments exist) it should not be raised upon the foreign article which competes with the domestic article, and thus discriminate in favor of our own and against the foreign, rather than to admit to equality in our markets untaxed, and upon equal terms with our own producers, the products of our

that it in no wise controlled or influenced the

The protective system but invokes the highest law of nature, that of self-preservation. There is every reason, founded in justice, why the American producer should in every constitutional way be favored as against the foreign producer whose products compete with his. This is our natural market. We have made it. We have made it after a century of struggle. We have made it at a cost of capital, and brain, and muscle. We have preserved it against foreign wars and domestic conflicts, at great sacrifice of men and money. The foreign producer has contributed nothing to the growth or development of the country. Whatever influence he has exerted has been against us and to our detriment. He has nothing in common with us. He is without the jurisdiction of our laws. He cannot be reached by the tax-gatherer. He is exempt from all civil obligations in every part of the Republic. We can make no requisition upon him, either in peace or in war. Our mode of reaching him is through the product he would send to our markets. We can demand of him that his merchandise shall make contribution to our treasury if he would enjoy the use of our markets. We can make him serve us in no other

In case of a revenue 'ariff, as I have pointed out, his product never bears the burden. Whatever we put upon it is borne by our own people, and in no wise shared by bim. This principle of care for our own is founded upon the highest authority, human and divine. It commences with the family, extends up through the community, to the State, and at last to the Nation. There is no city in the country in any section that does not invoke this principle in the administration of municipal government for the protection and encouragement of its own citizens. The itinerant vender is taxed in every city of the land. If he would expose his wares upon the streets of Atlanta at public auction I doubt not the city government compels him to pay a tax for the privilege of doing it, and that tax is added to the ordinary revenues of the city to assist in meeting its obligations. Now, why is this done? Upon exactly the same principle that we tax the foreign competing product under the system of protection. It is done to protect and defend the resident merchants of your city, who are with you always, within your jurisdiction, subject to your laws, contributing to the wealth and progress of your city, paying taxes to adorn and beautify it, paying taxes to support your public schools and make public improvements.

The itinerant vender has no such relation to your community. He is no part of your politi-cal organism. He comes and goes; he is not a tax-payer; he shares in none of the burdens of your people; he is a free-trader, who looks upon your market as much his and as open to him as to your own tradespeople. Your city govern-ment taxes him to diminish the burdens borne by your own citizens. This is protection, simple and pure, and is the exact character of that which we would apply to foreign nations seeking our markets. Our fathers recognized this principle. It was emphasized in the second act ever passed by the Congress of the United States. The ringing words of that declaration for industrial independence I wish might find a lodgment in every American heart.

Whereas, It is necessary for the support of the gov-ernment, for the discharge of the debts of the Nation and for the encouragement and protection of manufacturers that duties be levied on imported goods,

A more positive declaration in favor of the protective system it would be difficult to find language to express. This was the first important legislative declaration under the federal Constitution. The only other law that preceded it was that of fixing the oath of office of certain federal officials. It was made even before Washington was inaugurated. It subsequently re-ceived his sanction, and it is a fact not without significance that his approval was given to it on a day memorable in American history, the 4th of July, 1789. It had the approval of James Madison, Rufus King, Roger Sherman, Trum-bull, Lee and a host of other leading men from all parts of the Union.

Additional tariff legislation was had in 1790. Some duties were increased. The journal of the House of Representatives discloses the fact that of the thirty-nine votes given in favor of the bill, twenty-one were from the Southern States, thirteen from the middle States and five from the New England States. Of the thirteen votes against it, nine were from the New England States, three from the Southern States and one from the Middle States. It will thus be seen that we are largely indebted to the South for the inauguration and establishment of the protective system in the United States, which has for the most part governed our legislation since the formation of the government. For nearly sixty years of our national life this principle in its fullness has been recognized in our laws, and whenever recognized it has been accompanied by commercial and industrial development, stimulating new enterprises and securing prosperity to the masses without a parallel in the

world's annals. The revenue tariff periods of our history have been periods of greatest financial revulsions and industrial decadence, want and poverty among the people, private enterprises checked and pub-lic works retarded. From 1823 to 1842, under the low tariff legislation then prevailing, business was at a standatill, and our merchants and traders were bankrupted; our industries were paralyzed, our labor remained idle and our capital was unemployed. Foreign products crowded our markets, destroyed domestic competition, and, as invariably follows, the price of commodities to consumers were appreciably raised. It is an instructive fact that every panic this country has ever experienced has been preceded by enormous importations. From 1846 to 1861 a similar situation was presented under the low

tariff of that period. Contrast this period with the period from 1860 to 1880, the former under a revenue tariff, the latter under a protective tariff. In 1860 we had 163,000,000 acres of improved land, while in 1880 we had 287,000,000, an increase of 75 per cent. In 1860 our farms were valued at \$3,200,000,000. In 1880 the value had leaped to \$10,197,000,000. an increase of over 300 per cent. In 18t0 we raised 173,000,000 bushels of wheat; in 1880, 498,000,000. In 1860 we raised 838,000,000 bushels of corn; in 1880, 1,717,000,000 pushels. In 1860 we produced 5,000,000 bales of cotton; in 1880, 7,000,000, bales, an increase of 40 per cent. In 1860 we manufactured cotton goods to the value of \$115,681,774; in 1880 the value reached \$211,000,000, an increase of upwards of 80 per cent. In 1860 we manufactured of woolen goods \$61,000,000; in 1880, \$267,000,000, an increase of 333 per cent. In 1860 we produced 60,000,000 pounds of wool; in 1880, 240,000,000 pounds, an increase of nearly 300 per cent, In 1860 we mined 15,000,000 tons of coal; in 1880, 79,000,000 tons, an increase of over 400 per cent. In 1860 we made 987,000 tons of pig-iron; in 1880, 3,835,000 tons. In 1860 we manufactured 235,000 tons of railroad iron, and in 1880 1,208,000 tons. In 1860 our aggregate of national wealth was \$16,159,000,000; in 1880 it was

843,000,000,000. From 1848 to 1860, during the low-tariff period, there was but a single year in which we exported in excess of what we imported. The balance of trade during the twelve of the thirteen years was against us. Our people were drained of their money to pay for foreign purchases. We sent abroad over and above our sales \$396,216,-161. This vast sum was drawn from the United States, from its business, from the channels of trade, which would have been better employed in productive enterprises, and thus supplied our wants for which we were compelled to go abroad. During the last thirteen years, under a protective tariff, there was but one year that the balance of trade was against us. For twelve years we sold to our foreign customers in excess of what we bought from them the sum of \$1,-612,659,755.

This contrast makes an interesting exhibit of the work under the two systems. You need not be told that the government and the people are most prosperous whose balance of trade is in their favor. The government is like the citizen, indeed it is but an aggregation of citizens; and when the citizen buys more than he sells he is soon conscious that his year's business has not

Our wealth increases \$875,000,000 every year, while the increase of France is \$375,000,000; Great Brissin, \$325,000,000, and Germany, \$200,-The total carrying capacity of all the vessels entered and cleared from American ports during the year 1886-87 in the foreign trade was 28,000,000 tons. The amount of freight transported by the railroads of the

The sum of our industries exceeds that of any other people, or tribe, or nationality. Mulhall, the English statistician, places the industries of the United States at \$11,405,000,000 annually, which is \$2,205,000,000 greater than those of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, nearly twice that of France or Germany, nearly three times that of Russia, and almost equal to the aggregated industries of Austria, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Hoiland, Australia, Canada, and Sweden

This advancement is the world's wonder. The nations of the earth cannot furnish such a splendid exhibition of progress in any age or period. We defy a revenue-tariff policy to present such an exhibition of material prosperity and industrial development. Arts, science and literature have held their own in this wonderful march. We are prosperous to-day beyond any other people. The masses are better cared for. better provided for, more self-respecting, and more independent than ever before in our history, which cannot be said of the masses of

One of the striking differences between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff is that the former sends the money of its people abroad for foreign supplies, and seeks out a foreign market. The latter keeps the money at home among our own people, circulating through the arteries of trade, and creates a market at home, which is always the best because the most reli-

The South has shared in this splendid progress, in this golden period of development. From 1851 to 1860 the average yearly production of pig-iron throughout the United States was less than 800,000 tons. In 1886 the States or Alabama, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Georgia, Maryland, Texas, and North Carolina produced 875,179 net tens, or 75,000 more than the whole annual output of the United States under the free trade period. The eight years last past have brought to the South wonderful progress. You had in 1880 19.435 miles of railroad: you have now 36,737 miles. and this is increasing. You raised in 1880 5,-755,350 bales of cotton; in 1888 you raised 6,800,-000 bales. In 1880 you raised 431,074,630 bushgrain, and in 1887 you 626,305,000 bushels. In 1880 you had live stock amounting in value to \$391,312,254; it is now valued at \$573,695,550. The value of your agricultural products in 1880 was \$571,098,454, in 1887 it had reached \$742,-066,460. In 1880 you produced 397,301 tons of pig-iron; in 1887 you produced 929,436 tons, and I am assured upon the best authority that it is upwards of a million now. You mined in 1880 6,049,471 tons of coal; 1887. 16,476,785 tons. You had in 1880 179 cotton-mills; you have got today 300, and they are increasing. The number of your spindles in 1880 was 713,989; they are to day 1,495,145. The number of your looms in 1880 was 15,222; they are over 34,000 pow. The value of cotton goods in 1880, which you produced, was \$21,000,000; in 1887 it was over \$43,000,000. And yet, in the presence of such progress, it is seriously proposed to reverse the policy under which it has been made. Surely a new era of industrial development has come to the South. Nothing should be permitted to check or retard it. To ber nature has been most prodigal with her gifts. Her hills and valleys have been made the storehouses of richest treasure. Coal and iron | do not want citizens who make Presidents, and mines wait impatiently the touch of labor and | Senates, and the House of Representatives to be capital, and tempt both with promise of lavish profit. Raw materials are found at every turn to invite the skilled artisan to transform them into the finished product for the highest uses of man. She possesses the fibers in rich abundance; her skilled labor should weave the fabric. It is said that there is nothing grown in any of

keep her from the front rank of the industrial States of the Union. Whether we discuss this question from princiole, from statistics, or experience, we must

reach the same conclusion; all lead to the same conviction. Let me give you some important evidence from high and undoubted sources. which confirms the argument which I have been making. President Fillmore said on Dec. 2. 1851, in his message to Congress, speaking of the condition of the country:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and pro visions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from \$68,701,921, in 1847, to \$26,051,373 in 1850, and to \$21,848,653 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year. The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestably that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

Again, he said in his message of Dec. 6, 1852: Without repeating the argument contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it can be coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing establishments are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost, thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer to that extent is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus produce. In the third place, the destruction of our manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our market, and he consequently raises the price of the article sent here for sale, as is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England.

In December, 1857, President Buchanau, in his annual message to Congress, said: The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the produc-tions, and in all the elements of natural wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

This testimony would condemn "a revenue tariff" in any court of the land. It ought to force a like verdict from the great jury of our

One of the chief complaints against the protective system is its alleged hindrance to foreign trade and a foreign market for our own products. It is argued that if we could import raw material from other countries free, and manufacture such raw material into products for use, we could export them at great profit and thus secure a standing in the markets of the world. This theory is wholly, as I believe, illusory. It is without substance. We have an example of free raw material in a certain line of manufactures-that of leather for boots, shoes, etc., etc. In 1872 hides and skins were made free so that our manufacturers could import them without custom-house burdens. They have had "free trade" in their raw material now for sixteen years. This industry has been an exceptionally successful one, and yet you cannot avoid being surprised when I say to you that in those sixteen years we have been able to export but 2 per cent. of the leather production of the country.

But if free raw material be necessary to se cure an export trade and the foreign markets, then I answer that our manufacturers to-day have substantial free trade in foreign raw ma terials which they make into the finished prod uct in the United States, provided they export it. Sections 3019, 3020, 3021 and 3022 of the United States statutes provide for the remission of duties on all foreign materials used in manufacturing for the export trade. The law is positive that all articles manufactured for export from imported materials, upon which duties bave been paid, shall, when exported, be entitled to a drawback of 90 per cent. of the duties paid on such raw materials. Some use has been made of these laws. The remission of duties in 1884 paid upon imported material manufactured for foreign markets amounted to \$2,256,638. On some articles the drawback is equal to the duty paid, but in no instance where articles are imported to be manufactured here and sent abroad

is the duty to exceed 10 per cent. And yet we are gravely told by the tariff reformers that we cannot reach foreign markets on account of the high tariff on the raw material, when, in fact, for foreign trade, foreign raw recognized as early as the administration of George Washington, and has been enlarged and What becomes, then, of the cry for free raw materials in the presence of this fact? The truth is, we are not so much concerned about the foreign market as we are about the home market. The latter is the best, and we have not yet been able to control it, and until we do, that should be our chief concern. But if any of our people are sighing for a foreign market and value it more highly than our own, they can import foreign raw material practically free of duty, and after advancing into the higher forms of manufacture can go out and possess the world's markets. Taxed raw materials do not now stand in their way, and it is hypocrisy to claim otherwise.

"The markets of the world" in our present condition are a snare and a delusion. We will reach them whenever we can undersell competing nations, and not sooner. Tariffs do not keep us out and free trade will not make it easier to enter them. Let me give you a brief exhibit of some of our foreign trade, what we buy and what we sell. In the year ending June 30, 1887, we bought of Mexico, the Central American States, British Honduras, and the governments of the West Indies and South America, products to the value of \$172,468,526 and we sold these governments of our products about 33 1-3 per cent. in amount of what we bought of them, or about 460,000,000; and as a duce this uncomfortable balance against us I need only state that more than one-half of the products we bought were not subject to any tariff tax at all, but were admitted free of duty. Upon what terms can we adopt a revenue tariff system in this country? In one way only, by accepting European conditions, and submitting to all the discomforts and disadvantages of our commercial rivals. The chief obstruction in the way of a revenue tariff are the wages paid American workingmen, and any return to that policy involves a reduction of the cost of labor. We cannot afford, Mr. President, to have cheap labor in the United States. Cheap labor means cheap men and dear money. I would rather elevate and improve the condition of my fellow-citizens than increase the value of money and the power of "money-bags." This is a Republic of free and equal citizenship. The government is in the hands of the masses, and not of the few. This is our boast, and it is a proud one. The condition of the masses, their well-being, their intelligence, their preparation for the civil duties which rest upon them, depend largely upon the scale of industrial wages. It is essential, therefore, that the best possible wages attainable shall be secured and maintained. This is vital and fundamental. We cannot without grave danger and serious disturbance-we ought not under any circumstances-adopt a policy which would scale down the wages and diminish the comforts of the American workingmen. Their welfare and independence, their progress and elevation, are closely related to the welfare and independence and progress of the Republic. We have got no pampered class in this country, and we want none. We want the field kept open. No narrowing of the avenues; no lowering of our standard. We want no barriers raised against a higher and better civilization. The gateway of opportunity must be open to all, to the end that they may be first who deserve to be first, whether born in poverty or reared in luxury. We do not want the masses excluded from competing for the first rank among their countrymen and for the Nation's greatest honors, and we do not mean they shall be.

Free trade, or a revenue tariff, will of necessity shut them out. It has no respect for labor. It holds it as the mere machinery of capital. It would have cheap men that it might have cheap merchandise. With all of its boasted love for the struggling millions, it is infinitely more interested in cutting down the wages of labor than in saving 25 cents on a blanket: more intent in reducing the purchasing power of a man's labor than the cost of his coat. Things are not always dearest when their price is nominally the highest. The price is not the only measure, but the wherewith to buy it is an essential factor. Few men before me but have found in the course of their lives more than once that that which was cheapest when measured by mere price was the dearest when they were without money and employment, or when their products could find no market, and, finding it. commanded no price at all commensurate with the labor required to produce them. Primarily. it is labor which is interested most in this question of protection. The man with money can seek other avenues of profit and investment, or can wait for his dividends, but the laborer cannot wait for his dinner, and the United States in a condition of dependence and destitution.

That is not the sort of citizenship we want. Next to the laborer, the farmer is the immedate beneficiary of the American system. It brings to his plantation a city of consumers. The farmer and the factor are brought into close proximity. The problem of transportation is the States, except Florida, that Georgia cannot profitably produce. She has coal, iron deposits, marble and building stone, cotton and the cereals. Nothing but her own folly, nothing but blindness to her highest and best interests can provided the fields. I need not tell a farmer in this neighbor-

hood of the beneficial effects of a home market. His own experience is better than any philosophy. Atlanta has given him an object-lesson. It has increased the value of his farm products and enhanced the value of every foot of ground

Benjamin Franklin, writing from London, in 1771, to Humphrey Marshall, comprehended the

situation when he said: Every manufacturer encouraged in our country makes part of a market for provisions within ourselves, and saves so much money to the country as must otherwise be exported to pay for the manufactures he supplies. Here in England it is well known and understood that wherever a manufacture is established which employes a number of hands, it raises the value of land in the neighboring country all around it; partly by the greater demand near at hand for the produce of the land and partly from the plenty of money drawn by the manufacturers to that part of the country. It seems, therefore, the interest of all our farmers and owners of lands to encourage our young manufactures in preference to foreign ones imported among us from distant countries.

The fathers of the Republic appreciated the necessity for a home market. They were all farmers and planters. They could not sell to each other, for each supplied his own wants. This was their situation. They recognized the importance of diversifying the occupations of the people. They must promote other pursuits than the cultivation of the soil. They must have, if they would prosper, consumers who would absorb the surplus products of the farm. The result was a protective tariff, and under it the wisdom and foresight of the founders of the Republic have been more than vindicated. Andrew Jackson put the case as well as has ever been done when he declared, in 1824, "Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus product? Except for cotton, he has neither a foreign nor home market. Does not this clearly prove. when there is no market either at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture, and that the channels of labor should be multiplied? Common sense points out the remedy. Draw from agriculture the super-abundant labor, employ it on mechanism and manufactures, thereby creating a home market for your breadstuffs, and distributing labor to the most profitable account and benefits to the country." One-third of the cotton crop of the South is consumed at home. Who would not wish that all of it might find a market in the United States. We would be better off; you would be better off. The country at large would be the gainer if the whole cotton crop was fabricated in our own mills by our own people. Transportawould make and buy more cotton cloths at home, and send abroad for less; idle labor would be employed; idle capital find investment; the South would increase its spindles and its looms, and general and permant prosperity would fol-

The tariff reformer seeks to flatter the New England manufacturer with the suggestion that he no longer needs protection, and should turn his influence in favor of the other system. He assures him that he has reached such perfection in manufacture, such completeness of organization, such advancement in mechanical skill, that he has nothing to fear from competition abroad, and that he has but to reach out for our own and the world's markets and they are his. He assures him that he has nothing longer to fear from foreign competition, but that his serious danger is from home competition; that while he is indebted for his splendid progress in industrial development to a protective system, he has outgrown it, and if it is to be continued the people of the South and West will become his dangerous rivals, and that to avoid this new competition he invites him to assist in withholding from the States which have been slower in industrial development that measure of legislative aid which has been so profitably invoked by the New England States and to which they are indebted for their wonderful advancement in mechanical and industrial pursuits. What do the South and the West say to this narrow and provincial view! It may be true that the New England manufacturer has reached that rank and that degree of perfection when protection to him is not so essential as it once was, but the West and the South are in exactly the same condition that New England was twenty years ago, and I am sure will insist that the same fostering legislation shall be accorded for their development that has been so long enjoyed by their more progressive fellow-citizens on the Eastern coast. The truth is, protection must be universal in its application; equally within the reach of all sections and all industries, or it should be abandoned altogether. It cannot be enjoyed by one interest to the exclusion of another. The New England woolenmills cannot demand protection upon their cloth and deny it to wool, and they do not. The rice planter cannot hope to enjoy full protection materials are practically free. This principle was | against foreign competition, and deny equal protection to the producer of salt. The sugar planter of Louisiana cannot invoke the power of made applicable to all imported materials, the Congress for protective duties, and yet deny drawbacks varying from 90 to 100 per cent. I like protection to industries in other parts of the country. The system must stand as a whole or fall. As Burke said of liberty, "It is the clear right of all or of none. It is only perfect when universal." It must be protective tariff for all interests requiring the encouragement of the government, or it must be free trade or a revenue tariff, and rest alike upon all classes and all portions of the country. We are different from any other nation, and it is that difference which makes us the best Our political system rests upon a principle different from that of any other. It is founded upon the consent of the people. If we had wanted it otherwise we would not have left

home, but would have remained the obedient child of an imperious parent. We would not have turned away from the mother country. We would have remained one of her dependencies. We would not have fought our way through blood and sacrifice to independence. We separated to set up for ourselves a free and independent political society, and that policy is the best for us which best subserves the purposes of our organization, our citizenship and civilization. It is ours to work out our own destiny, and in doing so furnish an example of a free and progressive people, whose industrial policy has made it possible to satisfy the best and highest aspirations of men, and which closes for all mankind the beneficence of our system and the opportunities which it presents. We bid them level their condition up to ours; we will not level ours down to theirs. We will remove all restrictions from international trade as we have removed all restrictions from interstate trade whenever they will raise their labor

and their conditions to our standard. Men of Georgia, upon this great industrial question there should be no North nor South. To us of every section have been intrusted the interests of our country—our whole country. To others have been confided the care of other nations and other peoples. We will not interfere with them; we bid them not interfere with us. My fellow-citizens, in this conflict, influenced by patriotism, national interest, and national price, let us be Americans.

THE FIFTIETH CONGRESS.

The Senate Rejects the Fisheries Treaty, and Mr. Morgan Predicts War. Washington, Aug. 21 .-- Almost immediately

after the reading of the journal of yesterday the Senate went into open executive session on the fisheries treaty, and Mr. Morgan proceeded with his speech in favor of ratification. He said the report brought in here by the committee on foreign relations is intended and well calculated to prevent the British government from doing anything more in the way of negotiation with us, except merely to find out what we mean by these declamations. I repeat a remark which I have sometimes had occasion to make in this debate, that if these were the actions of the British Parliament, and if the treaty which we had approved or were willing to approve had been laid before that Parliament by the Queen, and had been debated there as it has been debated here, and if such a report had been made upon it as has been made by the committee on foreign relations, charging the American people with outrageous and wilful violations of the treaty; and if it had declared that the time for negotiation with us in relation to this matter had passed, and this was not a fit subject of negotiation. I cannot be so mistaken in American opinion as not to feel entirely warranted in saying before this Senate today that we would accept that as a challenge to war. Now, how the British people may accept it, Mr. President, it is not for me to say, or even to conjecture, for I know not. I trust in God that the calamities which seem to lie before us, which would repeat those of the past, may not be of such an aggravated character as to force these two great and magnificent peoples into collision with each other about so small a matter as the duty on salt fish. Will that side of the chamber pardon me in saying, however, that when you have gone to your full extent, and when these calamities occur, and these trials are presented to our country, her interests, her feelings, her sensibilities shall all be ours, and we shall all march breast to breast with you with the same alacrity as if we had never divided with you on this question or any other. And what the majority shall declare to be the will of the American people in regard to this controversy in the future shall be our will. 'Whither thou goest, we will go.' And, I dare say, notwithstanding all the sneers, and

spend our money just as freely as you will; will shed our blood as you have not dared to shed yours in time past. Then you will find the old spirit of the Southern Democracy aroused. You will find that that man who can lead the American hosts to victory in the contest which you may bring about, and in the war which you may provoke, will receive from the united Democracy of the country that sort of love and affectionate reverence that was bestowed on Audrew Jackson, and that will eling to him and his memory in Democratic bearts in the South while time itself shall last, if we shall still be a

nation. The debate closed at noon, and then, on motion of Mr. McPherson, the treaty was temporarily laid aside in order to act upon resolutions heretofore offered by him, returning the thanks of Congress to the State of New Jersey for the statues of Richard Stockton and Gen. Philip Kearney, furnished for the old hall of the House of Representatives, and accepting them in the name of the Nation. The resolutions were adopted.

Consideration of the fisheries treaty was resumed, and the Senate proceeded to vote on the resolution offered some days ago, by Mr. Gib-son, providing for the recommittal of the treaty for amendment of report on a plan of arbitration. Rejected by a strict party vote-yeas, Democrats, 29; nays, Republicans, 31.

Mr. Gray moved to amend Article XI so as to provide that all United States fishing vessels shall be accorded, on all occasions, such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful supplies as are ordinarily granted to United States trading vessels, on obtaining a license for that purpose. The amendment was rejected by like party vote-yeas 28, nays 30.

There being no further amendment offered to any article, the treaty was reported back from the committee of the whole to the Senate, and the vote was taken on the resolution of ratification, requiring a two-thirds majority. The resolution was rejected by a like party vote -yeas 27, nays 30. Following is the vote in detail.

Faulkner. Pasco, Payne, George, Gorman, Gray. Ransom, Reagan, Vest. Hampton, Walthall, Jones (Ark.), Wilson(Md.)-27 Colquitt, McPherson. NAYS. Plumb, Blair, Hawley, Hiscock, Sawyer, Sherman, Spooner. Manderson, Siekbridge, Wilson (Is.) .- 30. Pairs--Call and Bowen, Butler and Cameron, Gibson and Cullom, Turpie and Davis, Eustis and Paddock, Hearst and Stanford, Kenns and Morrill, Saulsbury and Riddleberger, Vance and Palmer. Senator Voorhees did not vote. Mr. Morgan moved that the President be noti-

fied of the action of the Senate on the treaty. The presiding officer declared it so ordered under the rule. The Senate then proceeded to egislative business. Mr. Platt introduced a bill to pension the widows of soldiers without reference to the

cause of the soldier's death, provided they were married during the military service of the The Senate joint resolution appropriating \$200,000 to suppress infection in the interstate-

commerce of the United States was reported and placed on the calendar. Senator Stewart then made a personal explanation in regard to charges that he had offered

an amendment to an appropriation bill in the interest of foreign mining corporations. He denied the charges, and said that his amendment was intended to protect the people of Nevada Mr. Morgan said that, after consultation with the chairman of the select committee on the Pacific railroads [Mr. Frye], he proposed to ask

the Senate, to-morrow, to proceed to consideration of the bill relating to the debt of the Union Pacific Railway Company. The report was unanimous and the bill corresponded precisely with the bill reported unanimously in the House. The subject was one of pressing importance and magnitude. Mr. Plumb-Is it your purpose to bring it up for the purpose of addressing the Senatel

Mr. Morgan-No; for action.

Mr. Plumb-I hope that the bill will not be pressed at this session. I have an amendment of a very important character to move to it, and for that purpose alone I shall ask the Senate to let it go over.

Mr. Morgan-The debate will occupy two or three days. Mr. Plumb-More than that. I think it will occupy as long a time as the fisheries treaty

Mr. Platt-The bill for the admission of the State of Washington has been on the calendar for a long time as the unfinished business. It has been crowded out of its course by the fisheries treaty. That treaty being out of the way, I must insist that that business shall be proceeded with without delay. Then I will ask that the other two bills for the admission of Northern Dakota and Montana be disposed of. They have the right of way. I should insist on their being proceeded with to-morrow, except I understand that the Senators from New Hampshire and Iowa [Chandler and Wilson] have notice that they desire to address the Senate. After that I will mesist on going on with these measures to the exclusion of anything else. The following bills were taken from the calendar and passed: Senate bill granting the Leavenworth Rapid Transit Railroad Company the right to construct and operate its railroad through a portion of the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kan.: House bill to authorize the construction and operation of a street-railway and wagon bridge across the Rio Grande between El Paso and Paso del Norte.

curred in, and the bill now goes to the Presi-The conference report on the naval appropriation bill was agreed to.

The House amenament to the Chinese prohi

bition bill was, on motion of Mr. Dolph, con-

Mr. Vest, from the judiciary committee, reported a substitute to the House bill to change the time of the sessions of the Circuit Court of the western division of the Western district of Missouri, and it was agreed to, and the bill then The Senate then passed ninety-three private bills upon the calendar.

The following bills were also taken from the calendar and passed: Senate bill directing the Secretary of War to examine all accounts, papers and evidences in support of war claims of California, Oregon and Nevada growing out of the war of the rebellion, and to report to Congress; the Senate bill granting right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, Arkansas. After an executive session the Senate ad-

Proceedings of the House. WASHINGTON, Aug. 21.-Mr. Hooker, of Mississippi, introduced a bill which was referred to the committee on judiciary, changing the time for the assembling of the Fifty-first and subsequent Congresses to the first Monday in March of each year, instead of the first Monday in December.

Mr. Lyman, of Iowa, in explaining his reasons for objecting, for some days past, to the transaction of business in the the absence of a quorum, expressed his anxiety to have some general pension legislation enacted, and criticised the committee on rules for refusing to report a resolution assigning a day for consideration of such legislation. He was informed that that committee had not had a meeting since April last, notwithstanding the efforts of the Republican members of the committee to secure one. He also charged the Democratic side of the House with having filibustered against the adoption of the resolution called up on Thursday last by Mr. Morrill, of Kansas, fixing a day fo pension legislation, and with having adjourned the House on Friday and thus prevented the evening session for consideration of private pension bills. The responsibility for the failure of pension legislation had been fixed. It had been fixed upon the shoulders of these men who sat here by reason of the victories of the Union army and the magnanimity of the Union soldiers. He had thought that if a quorum was required to fix a day for pension legislation. it should also be required to pass appropriation bills, and he had, therefore, made the point of no quorum against the deficiency bill, but as that bill contained something for the benefit of the ex-soldiers of the Union, he did not wish further to obstruct the passage of the measure. and for that reason, and that reason only, he would not raise the point of no quorum against

Mr. McMillin, of Tennessee, said that the gentleman had made a mistake in regard to the action of the majority, and asked unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

Mr. Lyman-I object. Mr. McMillin-A more ungracious thing was never done. The gentleman knows that he himself forced the House to adjourn on Friday and thus dispense with the evening session. The House then went into committee of the whole-Mr. Springer, of Illinois, in the chair-

on the deficiency bill. The discussion of the French spoliation claims section was resumed, but without concluding the debate the committee rose and the House of the resolutions accepting, on behalf of the days. For particulars call on Congress, the statues of Richard Stockton and



Easy Teething

FOR THE BABY

Is most earnestly desired by every mother. At that trying season it is especially necessary that the infant's food be one that will perfectly nourish it, giving the needed strength. Lactated Food has carried thousands of babies through that fatal period. It should be the food for every teething baby, even when the little one is also breast-fed.

"Lactated Food is Cutting Teeth an excellent food for teething chil-without trouble. using it, and is cutting her teeth this hot weather without any trouble." MRS. MINNA O. BRAND, Iantha, Mo.

"My babe's digestive organ were extremely delicate, and of Health. he was not able to retain anything. We tried the different advertised foods with no success, when our family physician recommended Lactated Food. Its good effects were noticeable at once. He gained rapidly in flesh and strength, cutting six teeth during the time, and is now the perfect picture of health," MRS. J. A. JACKSON, Gardiner, Maine.

Stout nothing did him any good and Hearty.
until we used your Lactated Food. That gave him strength, and he is
now stout and hearty as a little child could be." JOHN B. Dow, Ravenna, Neb.

"Our little fellow was sick

At Druggists, 25c., 50c., \$1.00. Valuable pamphlets sent on application.

WELLS, RICHARDSON & CO., BURLINGTON VT

Philip Kearney, presented by the State of New Jersey, to be placed in statuary hall. After addresses by Messra. Phelps, Morrow, Buchanan, Cox and Kean, the resolutions were adopted, and the House resumed, in committee of the whole, consideration of the deficiency bill. No action was taken and the House adjourned.

MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENTS.

The Assignment of Methodist Protestant Ministers to Various Places.

Mr. LEBANON, Aug. 21. - The Indiana Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, in session here, has made the following appointments: Indianapolis District-D. W. Evans, chairman. Indianapolis: Dillon-street Church, to be supplied Indianola Mission, J. C. Sharp: Laurel and Duck Creek, J. R. French; Liberty Mission, in hands of board of church extension; Mooresville and Grove-land, D. W. Evans: Morristown, S. J. Jones; Pleasant land, D. W. Evans; Morristown, S. J. Jones; Pleasant Hill and Friendship, J. G. Smith; Sugar Creek, J. R. Lenbart; Tanner's Creek, J. M. B. Reeves; Union, J. McPhail. Evangelists—S. M. Lowden and I. Duckworth. Superannuated—T. Bland and J. Low. Deceased—Joseph Proctor. Received letters of standing—J. Heim and C. W. Evans. Without appointment at his own request—W. W. Lineberry. To be employed—Eli Thomas.

Muncie District—T. E. Lapcaster, chairman. Elwood, M. S. Morrison; Hanfield, J. H. C. McKinney; Rogersville. Ithamer Nelson; Muncie, T. E. Langersville. Ithamer Nelson; Muncie, T. E. Langersville.

Rogersville, Ithamer Nelson; Muncie, T. E. Lan-caster; Muncie Circuit, G. W. Boxell; Pipe Creek, W. H. Fisher; Jonesboro, W. H. Green; Treaty Mission, W. H. Rogers; corresponding secretary Semi-centen-nial Commission, H. Stackhouse; supernumerary, J. M. DeHority, M. D.; superannuated, J. Boxell, H. Fulton and S. Lineberry; received letter of standing, D. S. Boswell; in hands of president, G. W. Bundy and J. H. G. Prim. Fort Wayne District-D. McEachron, chairman. Harlan, J. W. Albright; Kendallville, J. L. Barciay: New Haven, D. McEachron; Plymouth, J. O. Ledbet-

F. M. Hussey. Wabash District-J. C. McLin, chairman. Hart-ford, W. L. Martin; Dunkirk, J. C. McLin; Wabash, M. F. Iliff; Keystone, E. Conn; Salamonie, A. G. Mendenhall; in the hands of president, J. H. Neher and C.

ter; St. Joe, J. M. Langley; agent for Adrian College,

Frankfort District-L. Coomer, chairman. Frankfort, W. G. Callahan; Burlington and Monticello, L. Coomer; Grand Prairie and Medaryville, L. Hook Michigantown, to be be supplied; Milledgeville, W.
H. Rogers; Zionsville Mission, W. I. Davenport; received letters of standing, T. S. Ransopher and S.
Bloomer: in hands of president, R. Magart.
Worthington District—J. T. Harrison, chairman.
Monroe, to be supplied; Prairie and Worthington, J.
T. Harrison; Richland, J. I. Bailey; West Union, P.
M. Viney; Martinsville, J. C. Rickets; evangelist, S.
H. Flood; in hands of president, A. S. Baker; super-

White River Conference, U. B. Chnrch. pecial to the Indianapolis Journal

annuated, M. H. Adams.

HARTSVILLE, Aug. 21 .- The White River Conference. United Brethren Church, closed its annual session held at this place yesterday. The following is a list of the appointments:

Indianapolis District—I. M. Tharp, presiding elder. Indianapolis station, D. O. Darling; Fall Creek, Wm. Gossett; Elwood, H. J. Ketner; Daleville, J. Cranor, Warrington, M. F. Dawson; Sugar Creek, J. T. Roberts; Blue River, W. A. Oler; Honey Creek, J. H. Wyant: Clifty, Alonzo Myer; Hartsville station, N. D. Welfard.

Dublin District—Z. McNew, presiding elder. Dublin, A. Rust; Economy, C. W. Rector; New Castle Station, R. N. Young; Stony Creek, M. L. Bailey, Selma, J. W. Utsler; Bloomingsport, R. Steele; Williamsburg, A. J. Bolen; Abington, L. O. Chenoweth; Franklin, John Seelig; White Water, J. Y. DeMun-

Marion District-A. C. Wilmore, presiding elder. Marion, I. V. McCarty; Lincolnville, A. C. Rice; Andrews, Asbury Myer; Salamonie, C. B. Small; Mont-pelier, M. O. Jarvis; Hartford City, J. M. Kabrich; New Corner, H. W. Robbins; Fairmount, T. E. Kinnaman; Kokomo, W. T. Boice; Xenia, O. E. Evans; Bishop Pacific district, M. Wright; associate editor Conservator, H. Floyd.

Fred Douglass Reproves Langston. PETERSBURG, Va., Aug. 21 .- Mr. Fred Doug-

lass, in reply to a letter from a resident of the Fourth congressional district, has written a letter giving his reasons why the colored voters of that district should not support John M. Langston for Congress. Mr. Douglass says that he recognizes the Republican party as the sheet anchor of the colored man's political hopes, and the safety of the party should not be imperiled simply on account of color. Mr. Douglass says the nomination of Langston ought not to be made, and that his (Langston's) insolent announcement of his determination to force his nomination by threatening the Republican party with divisions by running for Congress with or without the consent of that party fairly places him beyond the pale of Republican support.

Moore and Mrs. Norton.

Toponto, Ont., Aug. 21.-Moore, the journalist, and Mrs. Norton, who recently eloped from St. Louis, are here living in a fashionable boarding-house. Moore says that a satisfactory arrangement has been made with regard to the property which Mrs. Norton took away with her.

The Last Low-Rate Excursion To Niagara Falls and Toronto will leave on Aug. 28, via the popular "Bee-line" railway. Only \$5 proceeded, as the special order, to consideration | to Niagara Falls; Toronto, \$6. Tickets good five